UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE            | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/082,874  | 02/26/2002             | Tomas Diez           | 02-171              | 4966             |
| GEORGE A. C   | 7590 09/17/200<br>OURY | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.                                    |                        |                      | VO, HUYEN X         |                  |
| Suite 1201<br>900 Chapel Street<br>New Haven, CT 06510-2802 |                        | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|   |                        | 2626                 |                     |                  |
|   |                        |                      |                     |                  |
|   |                        |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|   |                        |                      | 09/17/2008          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |        |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--------|--|--|--|
|  | 10/082,874   | DIEZ ET AL.   |        |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |        |  |  |  |
|  | HUYEN X. VO  | 2626  |        |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence ad  | ldress |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |        |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju   | ne 2008.   |   |        |  |  |  |
| / <u> </u>   | action is non-final.   |   |        |  |  |  |
| ·=   | , <del></del>  |   |        |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 25</u> is/are pending in the appl   | lication.  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 25</u> is/are rejected.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  | election requirement.  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>2/26/2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign   | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)  | n-(d) or (f).   |        |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   | priests, amaie de <b>c</b> .c.c. 3 · · · (a)   | ( ( ) ( ) ( )   |        |  |  |  |
| •—   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |        |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |  |   |        |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary   | (PTO-413)   |        |  |  |  |
| 2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Da  | ate   |        |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 5)  Notice of Informal P 6) Other:   | atent Application   |        |  |  |  |
| . apor rio(o), man bato  | o,   |   |        |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/082,874 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. In response to applicant's argument regarding the system of Salazar et al. fail to teach a control module being located far away from the remote command receiver and is outside the noise zone (page 1-2 of the REMARKS section), Salazar et al. fully disclose this feature in that the controlled device located far away from the control module (col. 8, lines 56-61 "remote system"). Furthermore, HVAC systems are traditionally known to be located outside of the building and are far away from the control module (e.g. thermostat), which is often located inside of the building in a convenient location for the users. With good insulation in large buildings (e.g. hotel, mall, etc), the location of the control module would be well beyond the noise zone produced by the HVAC systems. The only feature Salazar et al. do not teach is the specific noise zone of 60 dB A produced by the HVAC system producing a noise zone of 60 dB A.
- 3. Examiner noted that the citation "(wireless communication between module 1 and module 2 in figure 6)" in claims 3-6 was an error. As indicated, official notice was taken for the rejection of all claims 3-6.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,874 Page 3

Art Unit: 2626

4. The applicant has also challenged the official notice that examiner relied upon for the teaching of wireless communications including light-based and infrared communications claimed in claims 3-6. Geilhufe et al. (USPN 6584439) is now relied upon for the teaching of these limitations.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-2, 7-10, 12, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salazar et al. (US 5774841) in view of ESI Engineering Publication.
- 7. Regarding claim 1, Salazar et al. disclose a control system for a heating, ventilating or air conditioning (HVAC) system, comprising:

a remote command receiver for receiving instructions for said HVAC system (controlled system 30 or external computer 40 in figure 1); and

a control module (speech recognizer 100 in figure 1), comprising:

(i) a speech receiving member for receiving speech commands (*audio transducer 20 in figure 1 for receiving speech instructions*); and

(ii) a converter for converting said speech commands to HVAC system instructions (col. 7, lines 24-35 or speech recognizer 100 issuing HVAC instruction upon recognition of the input speech command); wherein said control module is communicated with said remote command receiver for conveying said HVAC system instructions from said control module to said remote command receiver (col. 7, lines 24-35, the speech recognizer 100 issues instructions to the controlled system 30 or external computer 40 in figure 1); said control module is positioned relative to said component outside of said noise zone (speech recognizer 100 or control module is located far away from the controlled system 30 or external system 40 in figure 1 as indicated by the communication paths 53 and 54; also, referring to figure 2, the control module or computer system is located far away from the robotic system 75 as indicated by the communication path 13).

Salazar et al. fail to specifically disclose wherein said heating, ventilation or air conditioning system includes an HVAC component which generates a noise zone wherein operating noise of said component is greater than 60 dB A. However, ESI Engineering teaches an HVAC component which generates a noise zone wherein operating noise of said component is greater than 60 dB A (*Table on the first page, right column*).

Since Salazar et al. and ESI Engineering are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Salazar et al. by incorporating the teaching of

ESI Engineering in order able technician to install control module outside of the noise zone to prevent noise from corrupting input speech commands to improve speech recognition accuracy.

- 8. Regarding claim 2, Salazar et al. further disclose the control system of claim 1, wherein said control module further comprises a transmitter for transmitting said HVAC system instructions to said remote command receiver (*speech recognizer 100 in figure 1 transmits instructions to the controlled system 30 or external computer 40*).
- 9. Regarding claims 7-10, Salazar et al. further disclose the system of claim 1, wherein said control module further comprises an indicator member for identifying a received speech command (col. 7, lines 35-55, indicator member can be a speaker for output audible feedback or monitor for displaying visual feedback), and wherein said control module further comprises a storage member for storing known speech patterns and corresponding indicators (col. 7, lines 32-38, feedback is an audio message suggesting that the audio message is pre-stored in the system), and wherein said control module is adapted to compare said received speech command with said known speech patterns and to output an indicator corresponding to said received speech command (col. 7, lines 35-55, audio feedback message is sent to audio transducer or speaker), wherein said indicator member is a speech simulator and said corresponding indicators are signals for generating speech (col. 7, lines 35-55, audio feedback message is sent to audio transducer or speaker), and wherein said storage member

also stores commands for generating the HVAC system instructions corresponding to said known speech patterns whereby said control module acknowledges said received speech command and transmits corresponding to HVAC system instructions (referring to system in figure 1; speech recognition unit 100 recognizes the input speech command and issues instructions to the controlled system 30 (HVAC) or external computer 40).

- 10. Regarding claims 12, Salazar et al. further disclose the system according to claim 1, wherein said control module further comprises a base member adapted for supporting said module on a flat surface (speech recognizer 100in figure is a processor housed within a circuit board on a flat surface).
- 11. Regarding claim 25, Salazar et al. further disclose a method for operating a system according to claim 1 to control a heating, ventilating or air conditioning (HVAC) component, comprising the steps of:

positioning said control module outside said noise zone (speech recognizer 100 or control module is located far away from the controlled system 30 or external system 40 in figure 1 as indicated by the communication paths 53 and 54; also, referring to figure 2, the control module or computer system is located far away from the robotic system 75 as indicated by the communication path 13);

receiving a speech command at said control module (audio transducer 20 in figure 1 for receiving input speech commands);

converting said speech command to HVAC system instructions at said control module (speech recognizer 100 in figure 1 issuing HVAC instructions, upon recognizing the input speech command, to the controlled system 30 or external computer 40); and

sending said HVAC system instructions from said control module to said component (speech recognizer 100 in figure 1 issuing HVAC instructions, upon recognizing the input speech command, to the controlled system 30 or external computer 40).

Salazar et al. fail to specifically disclose providing said heating, ventilation or air conditioning component which generates a noise zone wherein operating noise of said component is greater than 60 dB A. However, ESI Engineering teaches providing said heating, ventilation or air conditioning component which generates a noise zone wherein operating noise of said component is greater than 60 dB A (*table in the first page, right column*).

Since Salazar et al. and ESI Engineering are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Salazar et al. by incorporating the teaching of ESI Engineering in order able technician to install control module outside of the noise zone to prevent noise from corrupting input speech commands to improve speech recognition accuracy.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,874

Page 8

Art Unit: 2626

12. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salazar et al. (US 5774841) in view of in view of ESI Engineering Publication, and further in view of official notice.

- 13. Regarding claims 3-6, Salazar et al. fail to specifically disclose wherein said transmitter is a wireless transmitter, and said remote command receiver is a wireless receiver, wherein said transmitter and said remote command receiver are communicated by wireless communication selected from the group consisting of light-based communication radio communication and combinations thereof, wherein said transmitter and said remote command receiver are communicated by light-based communications, wherein said transmitter and said remote command receiver are communicated by infrared communications. However, examiner takes official notice that these types of transmitters are well-known in the art.
- 14. Claims 11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salazar et al. (US 5774841) in view of in view of ESI Engineering Publication, and further in view of Bush et al. (US 6397186).
- 15. Regarding claim 11, Salazar et al. fail to specifically disclose the system of claim 1, wherein said control module further comprises a neural network adapted to train said control module for receiving personalized speech commands, and a storage member for storing personalized speech data and corresponding HVAC system instructions.

However, Bush et al. teach that the control module further comprises a neural network adapted to train said control module for receiving personalized speech commands, and a storage member for storing personalized speech data and corresponding HVAC system instructions (*col.* 10, line 47 to col. 11, line 7).

Since Salazar et al. and Bush et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Salazar et al. by incorporating the teaching of Bush et al. in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

16. Regarding claim 13, Salazar et al. fail to specifically disclose the system according to claim 12, wherein said control module further comprises a plug member for connecting to an AC power source and an AC-DC transformer for supplying DC power to said control module. However, Bush et al. teach that said control module further comprises a plug member for connecting to an AC power source and an AC-DC transformer for supplying DC power to said control module (*col. 9, lines 13-19*).

Since Salazar et al. and Bush et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Salazar by incorporating the teaching of Bush et al. in order to provide power for the system.

17. Regarding claim 14, Tamura fails to specifically disclose the system according to claim 12, wherein the speech receiving member comprises a multi-directional

microphone. However, Bush et al. teach that the speech receiving member comprises a multi-directional microphone (*col.* 7, *lines* 33-52).

Since Tamura and Bush et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Tamura by incorporating the teaching of Bush et al. in order to obtain a stronger speech command signal while minimizing introduction of unwanted noise.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Geilhufe et al. (USPN 6584439) and Johnstone et al. (USPN 4462080) are considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUYEN X. VO whose telephone number is (571)272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Huyen X Vo/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626 9/3/2008

\*\*\*